



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/768,023	02/02/2004	Nozomi Sawada	246853US-2 DIV	7240
22850	7590	08/03/2009	EXAMINER	
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C. 1940 DUKE STREET ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314				KAU, STEVEN Y
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2625				
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/03/2009	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com
oblonpat@oblon.com
jgardner@oblon.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/768,023	SAWADA, NOZOMI
	Examiner	Art Unit
	STEVEN KAU	2625

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 June 2009.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-6, 10-13, 15 and 19-23 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-6, 10-13, 15 and 19-23 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 02 February 2004 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ . |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>6/11/2009</u> . | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on June 11, 2009 has been entered.

Acknowledgement

2. Applicant's amendment was received on June 11, 2009, and has been entered and made of record.

Status of the Claims

3. Claims 1, 10, 19, 20, 22 and 23 have been amended, and Claims 1-6, 10-13, 15, and 19-23 are pending for further examination in this Action.

Information Disclosure Statement

4. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on June 11, 2000 is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statement is being considered by the examiner.

Response to Remark/Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-6, 10-13, 15, and 19-23 have been fully considered but not persuasive.

Applicant's arguments, "With respect to the rejection of Claim 1 as unpatentable of Kakutani and Ogura, Applicant respectfully submits that the amendment to Claim 1 overcomes this ground of rejection. Amended Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, '***an image forming part configured to carry out an image formation by recording image data amounting to one page on a plurality of the substitute recording media such that each of the plurality of the substitute recording media has one of a plurality of parts forming the image data amounting to one page.***'

Kakutani and Ogura, taken alone or in proper combination, do not disclose or suggest at least these elements of amended Claim 1", pages 9-11, Remarks.

In re, the Examiner disagrees with the conclusion. The limitation elements of "***an image forming part configured to carry out an image formation by recording image data amounting to one page on a plurality of the substitute recording media such that each of the plurality of the substitute recording media has one of a plurality of parts forming the image data amounting to one page***" are actually taught by Kakutani. For instance, **referring to Figs. 3, 5, & 11, and so on, upon the printing processing is executed, printing data from the host is analyzed by the analysis unit 12, and printing drive unit 15 starts printing and the tray selection judgment unit 14 determines whether or not the paper size and paper type specified agree with the paper size and type based on**

the tray set table 10; in the case the agreement is determined, printing process is executed on the specified paper; in the case the selection judgment unit does not find the agreed tray, the tray selection judgment unit 14 retrieves the alternative table for the corresponding tray for printing; that is, a complete printing processing indicates that forming the image data amount per page must be determined and processed per print data and print instruction from the host, col 6, line 55 to col 7, line 37. The structure elements of the image forming apparatus claim, i.e. a storage configured to store setting information; a processor configured to determine a user identification and to execute the print instruction; and an image forming part configured to carry out an image formation are disclosed by Kakutani (detail discuss is presented in the previous Action as well as the following sections in this Action).

Double Patenting

6. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the “right to exclude” granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to

Art Unit: 2625

be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

7. Claims 1-6 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 22 of co-pending application (11/396,685).

This is a nonstatutory obviousness-type double patent rejection.

Claim 1 of the pending application (10/768,023) is directed to an image forming apparatus with the following structure elements: a storage configured to store setting information; a processor configured to determine a user identification and to execute the print instruction; and an image forming part configured to carry out an image formation.

Claim 22 of 11/396,685 discloses similar claim limitations as claim 1 of the pending application.

Re. Claim 22 of 11/396,685 is also directed to an image forming apparatus with substantially the same structure elements, i.e. a memory configured to store setting information and an image forming part configured to carry out an image formation.

Claims 1 of the pending application '023 and Co-Pending Application '685 are summarized as below:

#	Current Application (10/270,698)	#	Co-pending Application (11/396,685)
Claim 1		Claim 1	

Art Unit: 2625

A	An image forming apparatus comprising:	A	An image forming apparatus comprising:
B	a storage unit configured to store a plurality of user identifiers, and for each user identifier there is also stored a corresponding recording medium size and a size of a substitute recording medium;	B	a memory configured to store setting information including at least a size of a substitute recording medium; and
C	a processor configured to determine a user identifier corresponding to a print instruction and to execute the print instruction by automatically changing a size of a recording medium to be used as specified by the print instruction to the size of the substitute recording by accessing the storage unit to determine, for the user identifier corresponding to the print instruction, which substitute recording medium corresponds to the size of the recording medium specified by the print instruction, when the size of the recording medium specified by the print instruction is not available;	C	<p><u>See dependent claim 30 – wherein</u></p> <p>the image forming part comprises: a processor configured to execute an instruction, wherein the image forming unit forms the image data received by the receiving part on the recording media having the size specified by the instruction if the specified size is available, and to form the image data on the plurality of the substitute recording media if the specified size is unavailable, when the processor executes the instruction.</p> <p>an image forming part configured to carry out an image formation which forms image data on a recording medium, by changing a specified size</p>

			of the recording medium that is to be used for the image formation to the size of the substitute recording medium based on the setting information stored in said memory when the specified size of the recording medium is unavailable;
D	<p><u>Referring to Fig. 2</u> of the pending application, the substitute paper size for paper size LT and B5 is A4, and so on.</p> <p>Paper size of LT (216 x 297 mm) is similar to the size of A4 (210 x 297mm), and the ratio is about 1:1 (reference, ISO 216, Paper Size, or see http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Paper-size).</p>	D	wherein a plurality of the substitute recording media used for the image formation depends on a ratio of the specified size of the recording medium and the size of the substitute recording medium when said ratio is represented by 1 :n or n: 1, where n is an integer, and
E	<p>an image forming part configured to carry out an image formation by recording image data amounting to one page on a plurality of the substitute recording media such that each of the plurality of the substitute recording media has one of a plurality of parts forming the image data amounting to one page.</p>	E	the image forming part is configured to record the image data amounting to one page on the plurality of the substitute recording media such that each of the plurality of the substitute recording media has one of a plurality of parts forming the image data amounting to one page.

Both claims 1 and 22 teach an image forming apparatus with substantially the same structure elements indicated above. Both claims 1 and 22 teach a storage or memory configured to store setting information of a size of substitute recording medium. Both claims 1 and 22 teach an image forming part configured to carry out an image formation by recording image data amounting to one page on a plurality of the substitute recording media such that each of the plurality of the substitute recording media has one of a plurality of parts forming the image data amounting to one page. Both claims 1 and 22 teach the limitation of changing a size of a recording medium to be used as specified by the print instruction to the size of the substitute recording by accessing the storage unit to determine, for the user identifier corresponding to the print instruction, which substitute recording medium corresponds to the size of the recording medium specified by the print instruction, when the size of the recording medium specified by the print instruction is not available.

The difference between claims 1 and 22 are: Claim 1 of the instant application does not teach the limitation of "wherein a plurality of the substitute recording media used for the image formation depends on a ratio of the specified size of the recording medium and the size of the substitute recording medium when said ratio is represented by 1 :n or n: 1, where n is an integer". However, Figure 2 of the instant application indicating when one size of paper is not available, i.e. LT is not available, then, A4 is the substitute paper for LT. As disclosed in ISO 216, Paper Size, the ratio of LT to A4 is equivalent to 1:1. That is, the limitation of "wherein a plurality of the substitute recording media used for the image formation depends on a ratio of the specified size of the

recording medium and the size of the substitute recording medium when said ratio is represented by 1 :n or n: 1, where n is an integer" is an inherent property of paper substitution. Another difference between claims 1 and 22 is that, claim 22 does not teach the limitation of "for each user identifier there is also stored a corresponding recording medium size". However, Figures 2, 4, 10 and 21 of the co-pending application disclose "setting information with respect to three user's who are identified by User Ids", Paragraphs 70, 71, 77 & 83 and so on, US 2006/0176531. That is, a print job must be identified with a user identification. Thus, it would be obvious to one skill in the art to modify the claim limitation to include "setting information with respect to three user's who are identified by User Ids", because of doing so, would have been to improve print job identification and print production efficiency.

Claims 2-6 are rejected under the nonstatutory obviousness-type double patent rejection because of their dependency to claim 1.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 1-6, 10, 12, 13, 15, and 19-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kakutani (US 6,817,794) in view of Ogura et al (US 5,608,494).

Regarding claim 1.

Kakutani disclose An image forming apparatus (i.e. the printer of Figs. 1, 2, and 4, etc., col 4, lines 51-57) comprising: a storage unit (i.e. a nonvolatile memory, col 6, lines 50-54) configured to store a size of a substitute recording medium (i.e. a nonvolatile memory for storing the alternative table, col 6, lines 50-54; and alternative table 20, as shown in Figs. 2, 4 & 6, and so on, in which a plurality of paper sizes and paper type are registered, col 6, lines 11-20); a processor (i.e. Kakutani discloses multiple embodiments which a printer having a printer drive unit performs printing processes of Figs. 3, 5 and 11, etc., and instruction from a host computer, Fig. 2, col 5, lines 45-50; thus, a printer must have a processor to perform such multiple processes) configured to determine (i.e. configured to determine print job, i.e. print job data from a host) corresponding to a print instruction (i.e. analyzing/judging print job data including print instruction from the host, col 5, lines 45-59) and to execute the print instruction by automatically changing a size of a recording medium to be used as specified by the print instruction to the size of the substitute recording by accessing the storage unit to determine (i.e. steps of S104 and S105 of Figs 3 and 5 disclose an automatically change size of a recording medium, col 6, line 55 to col 7, line 19), which substitute recording medium corresponds to the size of the recording medium specified by the print instruction (i.e. size and type of substitute recording medium is registered corresponding to the recording medium specified by the host computer, col 5, lines 4-27), when the size of the recording medium specified by the print instruction is not available (col 5, lines 4-27); and

an image forming part (**i.e. Printer of Figs. 2,4 & 6,etc.**) configured to carry out an image formation by recording image data amounting to one page on a plurality of the substitute recording media such that each of the plurality of the substitute recording media has one of a plurality of parts forming the image data amounting to one page (**referring to Figs. 3, 5, & 11, and so on, upon the printing processing is executed, printing data from the host is analyzed by the analysis unit 12, and printing drive unit 15 starts printing and the tray selection judgment unit 14 determines whether or not the paper size and paper type specified agree with the paper size and type based on the tray set table 10; in the case the agreement is determined, printing process is executed on the specified paper; in the case the selection judgment unit does not find the agreed tray, the tray selection judgment unit 14 retrieves the alternative table for the corresponding tray for printing; that is, a complete printing processing indicates that forming the image data amount per page must be determined and processed per print data and print instruction from the host, col 6, line 55 to col 7, line 37).**

Kakutani does not disclose a plurality of user identifiers, and for each user identifier there is also stored a corresponding recording medium size; and for the user identifier corresponding to the print instruction.

However, Kakutani discloses an alternate table set 200 in Fig. 9, in which each Alternative table 20-1, 20-2, ... 20-n is corresponded to each of a plurality of host devices in the network. For example, the paper size and paper type of host device 1-1

are registered in the alternate table 20-1, and the paper size and paper type of host device 1-2 are registered in the alternate table 20-2, and so on. See col 9, lines 4-20.

The above described differences between the claims are obvious variations of each other.

In addition, in the same field of endeavor, Ogura teaches an embodiment in that a memory card is used to store operator's ID codes ,i.e. ID1, ID2, and ID3, etc., and counting number of sheets copied and size of the paper corresponding to ID codes as shown in Figs. 6 and 8, and col 6, lines 20-34.

Thus, the limitations of "a plurality of user identifiers, and for each user identifier there is also stored a corresponding recording medium size; and for the user identifier corresponding to the print instruction" are suggested and taught by Kakutani in view of Ogura discussed above.

Thus, having an image forming apparatus of Kakutani' 794 reference and then given the well-established teaching of Kakutani' 794 reference, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the image forming apparatus of Kakutani' 794 reference such that storing a plurality of users instead of a plurality of hose devices, to achieve for each user identifier there is also stored a corresponding recording medium size and a size of a substitute recording medium, and for the user identifier corresponding to the print instruction as taught by Ogura. And the motivation for doing so would have been to improve print job productivity and printing processing efficiency, i.e., improve print job identifying and so

does print job sorting, delivery and billing, and further the services provided could easily be established for one another with predictable results.

Regarding claim 3, in accordance with claim 1.

Kakutani discloses wherein the storage, unit is configured to store the information size of the substitute recording medium in response to an external setting instruction from outside (**i.e. size and type of substitute recording medium is registered corresponding to the recording medium specified by the host computer, col 5, lines 4-27**).

Regarding claim 4, in accordance with claim 3.

Kakutani discloses a notifying device configured to notify to the outside when the size of the recording medium specified by the print instruction is not available or when the size of the substitute recording medium is not stored in the storage unit, together with information indicating an available size of the recording medium, so as to request a selection of a recording medium size to use to execute the print instruction (**i.e. when there is an error is so judged, i.e. paper size and paper type specified are not registered, operator or the host device is notified, col 5, lines 1-3, and in responses to the outside, error processing unit 19 of Fig. 2 notifies tray selection unit 14 and the printing processing is continued, col 6, lines 21-44, and col 10, also see Figs. 18A-18B, col 10, line 56 to col 11, line 10**).

Regarding claim 5, in accordance with claim 1.

Kakutani discloses a setting device (**i.e. host devices of Figs 1, 2, and 4 and so on**) configured to set and store the size of the substitute recording medium in the

storage unit (i.e. paper size and paper type of substitute recording medium are specified by the host device and configured into the alternate table of Fig. 9, col 9, lines 4-20).

Regarding claim 6, in accordance with claim 1.

Kakutani discloses wherein said of a table storage device (**i.e. alternate table**) stores the plurality of (**host device**) identifiers, the corresponding recording medium size, and the corresponding size of the substitute recording medium in a table (**i.e. paper size and paper type of substitute recording medium are specified by the host device and configured into alternate table of Fig. 9, col 9, lines 4-20**).

Kakutani does not disclose said of a table storage device stores the plurality of user identifiers.

However, base on the same rational discussed in Claim 1 rejection above, Kakutani discloses an alternate table set 200 in Fig. 9, in which each 20-1, 20-2, ... 20-n is corresponded to each of a plurality of host devices in the network. For example, the paper size and paper type of host device 1-1 are registered in the alternate table 20-1, and the paper size and paper type of host device 1-2 are registered in the alternate table 20-2, and so on. See col 9, lines 4-20.

The above described differences between the claims are obvious variations of each other.

Thus, having an image forming apparatus of Kakutani' 794 reference and then given the well-established teaching of Kakutani' 794 reference, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to

modify the image forming apparatus of Kakutani' 794 reference such that storing a plurality of users instead of a plurality of host devices, to achieve a table storage device stores the plurality of user identifiers; since doing so would increase the versatility of the image forming apparatus and further the services provided could easily be established for one another with predictable results.

Regarding claim 10.

Claim 10 is directed to an image forming method claim which substantially corresponds to operation of the device in claim 1, with method steps directly corresponding to the function of device elements in claim 1. Thus, claim 10 is rejected as set forth above for claim 1.

Regarding claim 12, in accordance with claim 10.

Claim 12 is directed to an image forming method claim which substantially corresponds to operation of the device in claim 3, with method steps directly corresponding to the function of device elements in claim 3. Thus, claim 12 is rejected as set forth above for claim 3.

Regarding claim 13, in accordance with claim 12.

Claim 13 is directed to an image forming method claim which substantially corresponds to operation of the device in claim 4, with method steps directly corresponding to the function of device elements in claim 4. Thus, claim 13 is rejected as set forth above for claim 4.

Regarding claim 15, in accordance with claim 10.

Claim 15 is directed to an image forming method claim which substantially corresponds to operation of the device in claim 6, with method steps directly corresponding to the function of device elements in claim 6. Thus, claim 15 is rejected as set forth above for claim 6.

Regarding claim 19.

Claim 19 is directed to a computer-readable storage medium claim which substantially corresponds to operation of the device in claim 1, with processing steps directly corresponding to the function of device elements in claim 1. Thus, claim 19 is rejected as set forth above for claim 1.

Regarding claim 20.

Claim 20 is directed to a computer-readable storage medium claim which substantially corresponds to operation of the device in claim 1, with processing steps directly corresponding to the function of device elements in claim 1. Thus, claim 20 is rejected as set forth above for claim 1.

Regarding claim 21.

Kakutani discloses wherein the computer (**i.e. a CPU or a central process unit**) is one of a computer within a host unit (**i.e. host devices of Figs. 1, 2, and 10 and etc.**) which outputs the print instruction with respect to an image forming apparatus and a computer within the image forming apparatus which prints the-information on the recording medium (**i.e. host device outputs print data, which includes instruction, i.e. paper size and paper type, to printer of Figs. 1, 2, and 10, etc., the processor**

having a printer drive unit performs printing process, Figs. 1, 2, and 10, etc., and col 9, lines 21-57).

Regarding claim 22.

Claim 22 is directed to an image forming device claim which substantially corresponds to operation of the device in claim 1, with function elements directly corresponding to the function of device elements in claim 1. Thus, claim 22 is rejected as set forth above for claim 1.

Regarding claim 23.

Claim 23 is directed to a computer-readable storage medium claim which substantially corresponds to operation of the device in claim 1, with processing steps directly corresponding to the function of device elements in claim 1. Thus, claim 23 is rejected as set forth above for claim 1.

10. Claims 2 & 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kakutani (US 6,817,794) in view of Ogura et al (US 5,608,494) as applied to claims 1 and 10 above, and further in view of Yoshino et al (US 4,944,031).

Regarding claim 2, in accordance with claim 1.

Kakutani discloses wherein said storage unit is configured to store, in correspondence with at least one of the (**host device**) identifiers (*i.e. storage unit, i.e. paper tray, is configure to store at least one of hose device identifier, i.e. 1-1, 1-2, ..1-n, col 9,lines 3-20 and Fig. 9*).

Kakutani dose not disclose storage unit is configured to store in correspondence with at least one of the user identifiers and information specifying whether or not a zoom is required when printing information, and/or information specifying a printing position on the recording medium.

However, Kakutani discloses an alternate table set 200 in Fig. 9, in which each 20-1, 20-2, ... 20-n is corresponded to each of a plurality of host devices in the network. For example, the paper size and paper type of host device 1-1 are registered in the alternate table 20-1, and the paper size and paper type of host device 1-2 are registered in the alternate table 20-2, and so on. See col 9, lines 4-20; and the above described differences between the claims are obvious variations of each other; and

Yoshino teaches wherein said setting information includes whether or not a zoom is required when printing information, and/or a printing position on the recording medium (**i.e. magnification such enlargement and reduction ratio are used, col 8, lines 24-68, and direction identification marks for printing positions, col 5, line 44 to col 6, line 13**).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Kakutani' 794 such that storing a plurality of users instead of a plurality of hose devices and to include setting information includes whether or not a zoom is required when printing information, and/or a printing position on the recording medium as taught by Yoshino to allow user to select desired image parameter settings to produce hardcopies with satisfactory image quality.

Regarding claim 11, in accordance with claim 10.

Claim 11 is directed to an image forming method claim which substantially corresponds to operation of the device in claim 2, with method steps directly corresponding to the function of device elements in claim 2. Thus, claim 11 is rejected as set forth above for claim 2.

Conclusion

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Steven Kau whose telephone number is 571-270-1120 and fax number is 571-270-2120. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 8:30am-5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Moore can be reached on 571-272-7437. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Steven Kau/
Examiner, Art Unit 2625
July 23, 2009

/David K Moore/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2625

Application/Control Number: 10/768,023
Art Unit: 2625

Page 21